

Dear FCC Chairman Kevin Martin:

Please reject the proposal by the "Intercarrier Compensation Forum," a coalition of SBC and other big phone companies that want to raise the Federal Access Charge on my bill to \$10 a month. This proposal eventually would raise my phone bill by \$66 before I even make a call.

Please take a strong stand today to protect consumers from this unwarranted rate hike.

Sincerely,

Name Marjorie K. Olson

Address 2666 No. Riverwood Avenue

City, State, Zip Peris, IL 61664

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

John Moore

3103 Garner Rd. , Hartselle, Alabama 35640-4400

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

FEB 28 2006

FCC - MAILROOM

February 16, 2006 07:31 AM

Kevin J. Martin
445 12th St. SW
Washington, DC 20554

Subject: Re: Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service CC Docket 96-45

Dear Chairman Martin:

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Our cell phone service costs are outrageous compared to the European countries. Are we to believe that our country is behind the tech curve. We doubt that. Private and POLITICAL GREED is the reason for all these bogus charges. Not only do we not need this new charge, the ones already being charged need to be addressed by a committee consisting of people who do not stand to gain from these charges.

You are proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge you to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume; long-distance users in the U.S.

We oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

John Moore

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

FEB 28 2006

FCC - MAIL ROOM

Naylan Vencil

1412 HAYWOOD AVE., ODESSA, Texas 79761-3446

February 19, 2006 08:56 PM

Representative Mike Conaway
U.S. House of Representative
511 Cannon House Office Bldg.
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Subject: Re: Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service CC Docket 96-45

Dear Representative Conaway:

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Naylan Vencil
Naylan Vencil

cc: *Kevin J. Martin, Chairman*

FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE